



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION

TIMOTHY ROBERT SEEK, JR.  
Plaintiff,

vs.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN,  
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,  
Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

§ CIVIL ACTION NO. 0:14-63-MGL-PJG

---

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION,  
REVERSING DEFENDANT'S DECISION,  
AND REMANDING THE CASE FOR FURTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

---

This is a Social Security appeal in which Plaintiff seeks judicial review of a final decision of Defendant denying his claim for Disability Insurance Benefits (DIB) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI). The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting to the Court that Defendant's final decision denying Plaintiff's claim for DIB and SSI be reversed pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and the case be remanded to Defendant for further administrative action as set out in the Report. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo

determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on November 24, 2014, and on December 2, 2014, Defendant filed a notice with the Court that she did not intend to file any objections to the Report. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court that Defendant’s final decision denying Plaintiff’s claims for DIB and SSI is **REVERSED** pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and the case is **REMANDED** to Defendant for further administrative action as set out in the Report.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 13th day of January, 2015, in Spartanburg, South Carolina.

s/ Mary G. Lewis  
MARY G. LEWIS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE